

Concordia University

COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Minutes of the meeting held on November 7, 1986

Present: C. Bertrand, Chairperson; L. Bonin, Secretary;  
D. Dicks; F. Shlosser; G. Valaskakis; M Anvari;  
T. Arbuckle-Maag; G. Auchinachie; C. Barton;  
R. Cronin, s.j.; G. Decarie; G. Dewey; M. Doughty;  
S. Dubas, s.j.; W. Gilsdorf; J. Locke; J. McGraw;  
D. Markiewicz; K. Mukherji; F. Muller;  
M. Oppenheim; R. Pallen; E. Preston; J. Ryan; W. Sellers;  
H. Shulman; G. Trudel; L. Van Toch; M. Verthuy; S. Hunt;  
D. Jean; S. Maguire; S. O'Hara; M. Shapiro; L-J. Regimbal;  
S. Robertson; I. Sideco; N. Wallace; A. Macpherson.

Absent with regrets:

P. Albert; M. Barlow; S. Mullett; G. Newsham; H. Proppe.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

86-9-1 It was moved and seconded (Trudel/Robertson) to  
approve the agenda. The Dean removed Item  
7(d) as this matter had been considered  
previously.

3. Approval of Minutes

86-9-2 It was moved and seconded (Robertson/Muller) to approve  
the Minutes of September 12, 1986. Two omissions were  
noted: First, on page 5, item 8, a member had asked if  
part-time representatives were to be paid for sitting on  
Council or whether their presence at Council was to  
constitute its own reward. The Dean replied that these  
were unpaid positions. Later (page 6, item 10), when it  
was mentioned that Fine Arts Council pays its  
representatives, the Dean said he would look into the  
matter.

A typographical error was noted on page 4, paragraph 6,  
line 2: "hardly a surprise." Vote: Carried.

86-9-3 It was moved and seconded (Valaskakis/Gilsdorf) to approve the Minutes of October 3, 1986. Two typographical errors were noted on page 4, item 9: Paragraph 2, line 6: "process was followed", and final paragraph, line 3: "development of teaching." Vote: Carried.

86-9-4 It was moved and seconded (Trudel/Mukherji) to approve the Minutes of October 24, 1986. Vote: Carried.

4. Chairperson's Remarks

The Dean reminded Council that nominations are being accepted for honorary degree recipients for the June 1987 convocation ceremonies. Each submission should be sent directly to Fr. Aloysius Graham, secretary of the Board of Governors, BC-209C, no later than November 15th with a succinct statement as to why the candidate is worthy of the honour, plus a curriculum vitae. The nominations that relate to Arts and Science will be sent to the Dean who will bring them before Council for approval.

Representatives from Education and Mathematics have been chosen to serve on the Arts and Science Advisory Committee on Computers. They are Professors G. Boyd and R. Hall respectively.

Senate amended Council's decision to have CUPFA manage the elections of the two part-time representatives and has now mandated Council to manage the elections. The Dean suggested that he discuss this with Susan Murray, President of CUPFA, and report at the December meeting as to how Council might best operate given this stricture.

5. Questions and Announcements

It was noted that the student representatives on Council had not been voting in the various elections of faculty positions on Council committees and it was asked if the students could vote. The Dean recalled that in late April or May the students had voluntarily decided that they would no longer vote in elections that were for faculty positions; he did not recall a resolution or motion that prohibited their voting in all Council elections. Thus the students had the right to now decide that they wished to vote and the Dean accepted this notice of motion for the next meeting.

Regarding the recent announcement of in-house scholarship winners, it was noted that the majority seemed to come from a very few departments and did not seem to be awarded

solely on the basis of GPA. It was asked if any inquiries had been made regarding the equity and justice of this system of awards.

H. Shulman stated that the Financial Aid office confirmed that the bulk of these awards came through the Loyola Foundation and there was a campus restriction. At present, fifty percent plus one of a student's courses must be taken at Loyola in order to qualify for these awards. The University is looking at this particular point because it is often difficult to determine campus designation.

H. Shulman also noted that fewer Arts students, as compared with Science students, etc., were awarded entrance scholarships. He suggested that perhaps a quota based on the percentage of faculty rather than the GPA be used as it was easier for Science students to obtain higher GPAs given the nature of their course material.

The Dean noted that a Senate committee chaired by Dr. McEvenue had been formed last year to investigate such questions. He suggested that these concerns be directed to Dr. McEvenue, with a copy sent to the Dean's Office.

#### Ratification of student members to various committees

##### a) Faculty Appeal Committee

The student members are Leon<sup>e</sup>al-J. Regimbal and Sean Maguire. One of the two student alternate members is Nicholas Wallace. The remaining position has not been filled.

##### b) Arts and Science Faculty Panel (Academic Regulations Regarding Cheating)

The six student members are Scott Robertson, Pierre Paré, Bettina Rosenberg, Ian Sideco, John Scott and John Lewinski.

##### c) ASFC Curriculum Committee

The two undergraduate student members are Jim Locke and Morty Shapiro. The graduate student member has not been elected.



## Elections

- a) Arts and Science Faculty Panel (Academic Regulations Regarding Cheating)

The Steering Committee nominees, Professors Alberta Boswall (Mathematics) and Ronald Coyte (Political Science), were elected by acclamation.

- b) Academic Programmes Committee

The Steering Committee nominee, Professor Brian Slack (Geography), was elected by acclamation to serve a one-year term.

- c) Arts and Science Advisory Committee on Computers

The Steering Committee nominees are Dr. W.L. Gardiner (Communication Studies), Dr. C. White (Psychology) and Dr. P. Bird (Chemistry). There were no nominees from the floor.

Professors W.L. Gardiner and P. Bird were elected.

The Dean thanked P. Regimbald for counting the ballots.

## Discussion Document (The Criteria for Academic Planning)

A newspaper clipping entitled "Report Recommends Major Overhaul of Education at U.S. Colleges" was distributed. Prof. Shulman mentioned that Council could perhaps benefit from major studies conducted in the U.S.

An excerpt from the 1986-87 Undergraduate Calendar (p.112) entitled "Principles of Education" was distributed by Prof. Preston.

Council moved to the Committee of the whole for discussion of the document (ASFC 86-9-D3) and related issues.

Lengthy discussion revealed that a majority of Council members felt the document needed to be more specific. The Dean underlined the on-going nature of the planning process and said that he would bring a revised document to Council with an amplified set of criteria for further, although not indefinite, debate.

86-9-5

It was moved and seconded (Gilsdorf/Trudel) to table the discussion document until the next Council meeting.

Vote: Carried unanimously.

### Major points brought out in discussion

Regarding student interest and student enrolment in programmes, these points are quite distinct and might be in conflict with each other in terms of priorities and strategies (e.g. service departments versus students in programmes). Departments need to know how the various criteria will be applied.

It was mentioned that some departments have a stronger commitment to graduate programmes and to general education in the liberal sense. Different strengths have thus evolved and therefore different standards should be applied.

One member mentioned that the document lacked a statement regarding quality. Enrolment was rather neutral. Another member felt that student evaluations should perhaps be considered as an indication of quality.

Regarding a strong research profile, what does 'strong' mean? The statement must be broad and inclusive yet not invite ambiguity and arbitrary interpretation. Would this mean the number of publications? Problems with quantitative norms and with items compared would be encountered.

Regarding strength of programme over time, would this be defined by enrolment, outside funding, size of the faculty or range of offerings?

It was noted that the document enunciated the principle of building to strength. Provincial committees evaluate strength of a department in the following terms: number and qualifications of active faculty as witnessed by teaching, research and grants; lab facilities and appropriateness to the programme; library resources; quality of graduate students and proportion receiving external support; numbers of graduate students finding jobs; number of undergraduates in programmes; quality of programmes; internal evaluations; opportunitie (i.e. uniqueness of a programme related to internal and external needs).

Regarding provincial priorities, how do we plan for 10-14 years ahead in terms of priorities perceived now? One member noted that Arts and Science must have an overall plan or be criticized by the government. Another felt that we should not plan as if austerity would last forever; a change of government might well bring an expansionary mandate. Planning should rather be done in the abstract and the general orientation should be the



best of the humanistic tradition.

Regarding external recognition, it was mentioned that our founding institutions were built in defiance of

recognition; it was suggested we keep our distinct history in mind.

Regarding realistic and defined goals, these would change depending on differing viewpoints as one person's realism was another's fantasy.

Regarding success in preparing graduates, what exactly does 'informed' mean? If this is an appeal for general education it seems inconsistent with a move towards programmes growing in number of credits. We should be referring to 'thinking' individuals rather than 'informed' individuals.

It was suggested that the criteria should not be considered in a vacuum but interpreted in relation to a statement of our pedagogical values (see Undergraduate Calendar p.112). One member felt that the list of criteria must include a mention of teaching. Another felt it necessary to address the question of what an Arts and Science education does before criteria are established so that we know what we are attempting to evaluate. What is the planning for? What else are we besides a philosophy of education and a 24-credit rule? A university must offer students options among programs, and some programs must always be offered.

One member felt the options before Council were limited in that Council was working from the criteria although they could be discussed and/or modified. It was noted that the Council of Higher Education was discussing CEGEPS at the moment; it was uncertain just what profile the non-mature student would soon have. The question of mature students must also be addressed as this type of student has changed.

It was noted that external economic factors which determine so much of academic planning were omitted. Final decisions may then be made on different premises. A member wondered how the meaning of the criteria could inform practice since the criteria were abstract. The issues arising will create conflict and be subject to multiple interpretation. A mechanism for judgment rather than the application of criteria is needed.

In response to a question, the Dean outlined how the process had begun. Each unit submitted a five-year plan

outlining areas to develop/reduce or remain status quo, assuming present personnel and no budget constraints. The plans were discussed with the Vice-Deans and the criteria listed here were distilled from these plans. A further step might be to check with graduates of the programmes. The Dean said that he had hoped that a document which was a framework could be established even though this would change and shift. He added that a meeting of all administrators of the university was planned, at which time general directions for Concordia would be explored. In this respect Arts and Science was somewhat ahead in that we have already begun the process and this document is the result of some of that thinking.

The Dean said that he and the Vice-Deans had subsets in mind under each of the criteria but he was unsure as to whether or not all should be stated in the document.

9. Graduate Curriculum Course Changes, 1987-88, Report 53G

86-9-6 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Oppenheim) that changes to the Ph.D. in Communication, a new degree programme which will begin 1987-88 if approved by Quebec, be approved. W. Gilsdorf verified that there were no resource implications. Vote: Carried.

86-9-7 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Maguire) that the change in degree requirements for the Ph.D. in Economics be approved. Vote: Carried.

86-9-8 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Muller) that the change in descriptions for the Ph.D. in Economics be approved. Vote: Carried.

86-9-9 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Knitter) that the addition of concentration in Adult Education for the M.A. in Educational Studies be approved. Enrolments in the area of 5 to 15 students from the Diploma in Adult Education were envisaged. There were no resource implications. Vote: Carried.

It was noted that the point referring to an admissions quota was not a Council matter.

86-9-10 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Oppenheim) that the changes with regard to the M.A. in Educational Technology be approved. Vote: Carried.

86-9-11 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Oppenheim) that the replacement of a required Religion course in the M.A. in Judaic Studies be approved. Vote: Carried.

86-9-12 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Oppenheim) that the change in degree requirements and the change in a course title for the Diploma in Library Studies be approved.  
Vote: Carried.

10. Proposed Name Change, Library Studies

It was moved and seconded (Trudel/Valaskakis) that this item be tabled until the May 1987 Council Meeting dealing with calendar changes. The proposed name, Library and Information Management, generated debate in the Academic Priorities Committee and opposition from other areas.  
Vote: Carried.

11. Next Meeting

December 5, 1986, at 1:30 p.m. in AD-131, Loyola Campus.

12. Adjournment

86-9-13 It was moved and seconded (Oppenheim/Pallen) to adjourn the meeting.